APPENDIX

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
JUN 2 1977
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1976

NO. 76-1713

JOSEPH. P. KENDALL,
Petitioner.

v.

BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

HARRY GOLDMAN, JR.
1605 One South Calvert Bldg.
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
Counsel for Petitioner.

The Paul M. Harrod Company, Baltimore, Maryland 21234

INDEX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Order Denying Petition for Rehearing
Filed March 4, 1977 2
Opinion Below Per Curiam, Unpublished
Decided January 26, 1977 3
Opinion of Benefits Review Board – BRB-75-205
Filed February 26, 1976 5
Decision and Order of Administrative Law Judge
July 10, 1975 11
Opinion of Benefits Review Board – BRB-74-120
Filed August 15, 1974 30
Decision and Order of Administrative Law Judge
Signed March 1, 1974 35
Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers'
Compensation Act Amendments of 1972 40

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1976

NO.

JOSEPH. P. KENDALL,
Petitioner,

v.

BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING
Filed March 4, 1977

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
No. 76–1454

Joseph, P. Kendall,
Petitioner,

versus

Bethlehem Steel Corporation,
Respondent.

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for rehearing, and with the concurrence of Judge Craven and Judge Hall,

IT IS ORDERED that the petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

FOR THE COURT

/s/ (illegible) F. Haynsworth
Chief Judge, Fourth Circuit

March 2, 1977

OPINION BELOW *PER CURIAM*, UNPUBLISHED
Decided January 26, 1977

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
No. 76–1454

Joseph P. Kendall,
Petitioner,

versus

Bethlehem Steel Corporation,
Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order
of the Benefits Review Board.

Argued December 7, 1976 Decided January 26, 1977

Before HAYNSWORTH, Chief Judge,
CRAVEN and HALL, Circuit Judges

Harry Goldman, Jr. for Petitioner; Thomas E. Cinnamond (Rudolph L. Rose, Semmes, Bowen & Semmes on brief) for Respondent.

PER CURIAM:

Joseph P. Kendall appeals the decision of the Benefits Review Board denying his claim for permanent partial disability under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act of 1972, 33 U.S.C. 901.

Kendall injured his back while working as a rigger. After recuperating from an operation on his back, he returned to work on the pier. He became a union steward. Then he successfully campaigned for the job of union president. After being union president, Kendall became a local representative of the AFL-CIO to the Baltimore Area Council on Alcoholism.

We find that there is substantial evidence on the whole record to support the Board's conclusion that Kendall could return to his job as a rigger without a loss in earning capacity if he should lose his job as representative to the Council on Alcoholism. There is evidence that, while working on the graving dock after his return to work, Kendall performed tasks similar to those he performed prior to the injury. His earnings since the injury have always exceeded his earnings before the injury.

AFFIRMED.

OPINION OF BENEFITS REVIEW BOARD
Filed February 26, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Benefits Review Board
Washington, D.C. 20210

JOSEPH P. KENDALL,
Claimant-Petitioner,

v.

BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION,
Employer-Respondent

BRB No. 75–205

DECISION

Filed as Part of the Record
February 26, 1976

Appeal from Decision and Order of George A. Fath, Administrative Law Judge, United States Department of Labor.

Harry Goldman, Jr., Baltimore, Maryland, for the claimant.

Thomas E. Cinnamond (Semmes, Bowen & Semmes), Baltimore, Maryland, for the employer.

Bruno DiSimone (William J. Kilberg, Solicitor of Labor, Laurie M. Streeter, Associate Solicitor), Washington, D.C.,

for Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, United States Department of Labor.

Before: Washington, Chairperson and Miller, Member.

Washington, Chairperson:

This is an appeal by the claimant from a Decision and Order (74-LHCA-15) issued in 1975 by Administrative Law Judge George A. Fath in a claim arising under the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, 33 U.S.C. §901 *et seq.* (hereinafter referred to as the Act).

On September 27, 1969, in the course of his employment as a third class rigger, claimant sustained an injury to his lower back requiring removal of a disc. Employer paid claimant compensation for temporary total disability from September 28, 1969, until June 10, 1970, plus medical expenses under Section 7 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §907. Claimant sought compensation for permanent partial disability equivalent to a twenty percent loss of wage-earning capacity beginning June 11, 1970, and the case was heard by Administrative Law Judge Herman Benn in December 1973. He determined that the claimant failed to establish an economic disability as contemplated by the Act and therefore denied the claim for compensation in 1974 (74-LHCA-15). That denial was appealed to this Board in 1974, and the Board was asked to determine whether the finding that the petitioner has not suffered any economic disability was supported by substantial evidence in the record considered as a whole.

The Board found that the Decision was silent as to future effects of the injury on claimant's wage earning capacity. The case was remanded for evaluation of the claimant's wage earning capacity, considering the type of work he performed prior to his injury and for any possible effect of his physical impairment on his ability to continue

to do such heavy work. The administrative law judge was also to consider claimant's prospects if he were forced to seek similar employment on the open labor market. 1 BRBS 76, BRB No. 74-120 (Aug. 15, 1974).

Administrative Law Judge Fath, on remand, reaffirmed the findings of Administrative Law Judge Benn and denied the claim. [Administrative Law Judge Benn had retired from Department of Labor service].

Claimant contends on appeal that Administrative Law Judge Fath had no authority to make the determinations required by the Board's remand order alleging that determinations of wage-earning capacity, as projected into the future, depend on credibility findings which can be decided only by the original administrative law judge or, if unavailable, by this Board.

The Board disagrees with claimant's reasoning that determinations involving credibility of witnesses cannot be made by an administrative law judge who has not heard the "live testimony".

> Courts of Appeals have ruled that when a trial examiner who had heard the evidence dies or retires before preparing his report and another examiner is designated to do this, there is no denial of due process, *N.L.R.B. v. Stocker Mfg. Co.*, 185 F.2d 451, 453 (3 Cir. 1950); *Gamble-Skogmo, Inc. v. F.T.C.*, 211 F.2d 106, 113 (8 Cir. 1954). And we on our own part have recognized "that the due process clause does not require under all circumstances that factual determinations be made by the person hearing the evidence". *United States v. Vater*, 259 F.2d 667, 673 (2 Cir. 1958) (dictum). [footnote omitted].

Utica Mutual Insurance Co. v. Vincent, 375 F.2d 129, 132 (2d Cir. 1967). Accordingly, the Board finds that

Administrative Law Judge Fath had authority to make determinations involving credibility on the record.

Claimant further asserts that Administrative Law Judge Fath had no jurisdiction to determine the matter since the Chief Administrative Law Judge failed to assign the case to Administrative Law Judge Benn, allegedly still available to the agency under 5 U.S.C. §554(d) although he had retired. This is nothing more than an unsupported allegation and there is no requirement that the agency make any effort to restore an unavailable officer to status of availability. *Gamble-Skogmo v. F.T.C.*, 211 F.2d 106 (8th Cir. 1954).

Under direction of the Board on remand, Administrative Law Judge Fath reviewed the record and concluded that claimant suffered no economic disability from the injury. This conclusion is supported by the record when viewed as a whole *Owens v. Traynor*, 274 F. Supp. 770 (D. Md. 1966), *aff'd*, 396 F.2d 783 (4th Cir. 1968). Administrative Law Judge Fath recognized that there is an anatomical impairment and discusses at great length the evidence he had to evaluate in order to come to his conclusion.

The record shows that after his return to work eight months after the injury, claimant worked as a groundman on the crane for over a year and then at piping work in the graving dock where he was promoted to first class rigger with a third class rigger as his helper. Claimant worked overtime, occasionally working 96 hours a week, and made more money after the injury as a rigger than before the injury. After his return to work, claimant also became more active in union participation and became a shop steward and subsequently president of the union local, a full time job. While presently working for the union, claimant is on leave of absence status with the employer.

The medical evidence clearly reflects an anatomical disability of at least 15 percent. Employer's doctor, certified

in occupational medicine, testified that claimant is able to perform the work of a rigger and that claimant was not given any light duty work in recognition of a disability on his return to work after the injury. Employer's doctor did, however, testify that given the claimant's medical history, he would not hire claimant without a waiver, but hiring someone with a waiver is not tantamount to a disability. This evidence is not conclusive as many union contracts do not permit pre-employment physical examinations.

The fact that claimant turned down a job offer as a crane operator at even higher pay because he allegedly could not climb up the ladder also is not dispositive. The administrative law judge, charged with determinations of credibility, chose not to believe that physical inability was the reason for refusing the job, but, rather, that such an isolated and sedentary job was not in keeping with claimant's active nature as is clearly shown in the record.

The record shows that after his return to work after the injury, claimant was able to perform the same work, worked long hours, made more money and received a promotion. This of course is not conclusive for a finding of no further disability, but it is indicative. *Twin Harbor Stevedoring and Tug. Co. v. Marshall*, 103 F.2d 513 (9th Cir. 1959). The Board's remand order directed that the administrative law judge consider the effect of the physical impairment on claimant's prospects on the open labor market. This point was specifically addressed by the administrative law judge, and in light of the entire record was found to be unpersuasive. Further, it is to be noted that the "open labor market" test for determining wage-earning capacity is not the sole criterion; it is a useful guide. *Lumbermen's Mutual v. O'Keeffe*, 217 F.2d 720 (2d Cir. 1954).

The Board finds that the record supports the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the Decision and Order appealed from. Administrative Law Judge Fath took on the

formidable task of evaluating the extensive and conflicting testimony in the record of this case. He recognized that doubts were to be resolved in favor of the claimant, *Friend v. Britton*, 220 F.2d 820 (D.C. Cir. 1955), and yet realized that conflicting evidence and testimony in the record do not alone imply that there are doubts to be resolved in favor of the claimant. *Melendez v. Bethlehem Steel*, 2 BRBS 395, BRB No. 75-126 (Nov. 7, 1975). He can accept or reject testimony in whole or in part and draw inferences from the record which must be accepted by this Board. *Todd Shipyards v. Donovan*, 300 F.2d 741 (5th Cir. 1962).

The allegations of bias and prejudice against Administrative Law Judge Fath are totally unsupported by the claimant and, therefore, must be rejected by the Board.

Accordingly, the Board affirms the Decision and Order of Administrative Law Judge Fath concluding that the claimant suffers no further disability.

/s/ Ruth v. Washington,
Chairperson

I Concur: /s/ Julius Miller,
Member

Dated this 26th day of February, 1976

DECISION AND ORDER OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
Judge George A. Fath – Case No. 74-LHCA-15
OWCP No. 3672 – July 10, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Office of Administrative Law Judges
Washington, D.C. 20210

In the Matter of

JOSEPH P. KENDALL,
Claimant

v.

BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION,
Employer

SELF–INSURED

Harry Goldman, Jr., Esquire
One South Calvert Street
Suite 1605
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
For the Claimant

Thomas E. Cinnamond, Esquire
Semmes, Bowen & Semmes
10 Light Street (17th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
For the Employer

BEFORE: GEORGE A. FATH
Administrative Law Judge

DECISION AND ORDER

This is a claim filed by Joseph P. Kendall for compensation brought pursuant to the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. 901 et seq. (hereinafter referred to as the Act) and the Rules and Regulations governing the administration of the Act, 20 C.F.R. Parts 701 and 702. The Claimant seeks compensation for permanent partial disability.

After timely notice a Formal Hearing was conducted on December 5 and 6, 1973, by the Honorable Herman T. Benn, Administrative Law Judge, at Baltimore, Maryland. The Claimant and the Employer (self insured), who were represented by Counsel, were given full opportunity to present evidence, oral argument, and briefs on the issues. The hearing was public and stenographically reported.

Statement of Proceedings

At the Formal Hearing the only controverted allegation related to the nature and extent of Claimant's disability:

> Judge Benn: Now, Counsel, according to the exhibit we just identified, it appears that the sole issue in this case, would be the nature and extent of Claimant's disability as it pertains to the Act we just identified. And all the other pertinent issues are uncontroverted Is that your understanding?
>
> Mr. Goldman: Yes, that's my understanding.
>
> Mr. Cinnamond: Yes, Your Honor . . . (Tr. 5)

The issue was fully developed by presentation of evidence directly and undirectly related to disability of Claimant. The parties submitted proposed findings of facts and conclusions of law.

On March 1, 1974, Judge Benn issued the following Order:

> "It is Hereby Ordered, that the claim for payment of compensation subsequent to June 10, 1970 under the Act is denied".

The Decision and Order was filed March 6, 1974, in the Office of the Deputy Commissioner pursuant to §702.349 of the Rules and Regulations governing the Act.

On April 3, 1974, the Claimant filed a timely Notice of Appeal. The Employer joined issue on Appeal. The Solicitor of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor, on behalf of the Director, Office of Workmen's Compensation Programs submitted a memorandum on appeal, suggesting that the Administrative Law Judge be affirmed.

The Benefits Review Board issued a decision on August 15, 1974, with directions as follows:

> "This case is remanded to the administrative law judge for reevaluation of the petitioner's wage earning capacity, considering the type of work the petitioner performed prior to his injury, the possible effect of his physical impairment on his ability to continue to do such heavy work, and his prospects if he were forced to seek similar employment on the open labor market."

A Petition for Reconsideration, filed by the employer and concurred in by the Solicitor of Labor, was considered and heard on oral argument. By Order dated September 17, 1974, the Board affirmed its decision of August 15, 1974.

The Administrative Law Judge, who presided at the formal hearing, is unavailable for action on the Order of Remand. The case is assigned to the undersigned for review, decision, and order.

Statement of Facts

Age and Martial Status

The Claimant, Joseph P. Kendall was born August 26, 1931, in Baltimore Maryland. He is married. He has a daughter by a former marriage who is married. The Claimant has no dependent children.

Education

Claimant attended many schools. He "finally wound up" at Clifton Park Junior High where he completed the eighth grade. He attended the Maritime School, Sheepshead Bay, New York, for a 30 day course in practical seamanship and graduated a boatswain's mate third class.

Employment

Claimant was employed by Standard Oil of New Jersey from 1946 until 1965 as an bodied seaman. (Tr. 18) Most of this period he worked as a deck maintenance man. He did chipping, scraping, painting, general maintenance work on deck, climbing rigging, tying up, and letting go. Along with these duties he stood regular watches.

His duties aboard ship required physical agility, endurance, and strength. The Claimant described in detail the work done, tools used, and the methods of performance. In summary, it is sufficient to say that the work required full use of the body for climbing, bending, stretching, and lifting.

The Claimant's application dated May 2, 1968, for employment with Bethlehem Steel Corporation, introduced and received into evidence as Defendant's Exhibit 1, shows employment by Humble Oil and Refining Co. – Marine Division for 18 years to February 1964.

Thereafter, Claimant managed a service station for 9 months ending in November 1965.

He again returned to sea as able bodied seaman and was so employed until he applied for a job as a rigger or painter with Bethlehem. At that time he gave "retiring from sea" as his reason for leaving the job of seaman.

Federal income tax returns for the years 1966 and 1967, the last years Claimant was employed as a seaman, show income from wages in the amounts of $7,893 and $7,527 respectively. (Complainant's Exhibit 1a and b)

As a seaman, Claimant was active in trade Union affairs. He was ship's delegate to SO (sic) Tankermen's Union, a member of its Board of Governors, and an Organizer. He was also an Organizer for Teamsters Local 866. These were nonpaying jobs in addition to his regular occupation.

In August, 1968, Claimant went to work for Bethlehem Steel Corporation, at Sparrows Point, Maryland, as a third class rigger. The job required the lifting and hanging of chain falls. These devices are equipped with hooks for attachment to heavy objects for lifting and movement. The hooks, weighing from 15 to 60 pounds, are lifted, moved and attached to the load by the rigger. He guides the chain falls for placement of the load by pulling or pushing the load.

On September 27, 1969, a Saturday, the date of the injury, Claimant was engaged in stowing spare hoses into the bow of a ship. He describes these hoses as being twenty feet long, eighteen inches in diameter and fitted with metal flanges. After being loaded onto the deck the hoses were lifted manually by the rigging gang into storage shelves. While engaged in this activity, Claimant felt something snap in his back.

The injury was reported to the supervisor. A myelogram revealed a herniated disc at L4. G. Lee Russo, M.D. performed surgery on Claimant on November 12, 1969, and removed the intervertebral disc at L4 and explored the disc at L5.

Claimant was paid compensation for temporary total disability from September 28, 1969, to June 10, 1970.

At the time of the injury, his average weekly wage was $157.33. (Tr. 23) ($8,181.16 per year)

Post Injury Employment

On his return to work on June 11, 1970, Claimant was offered and accepted a job as groundman on the crane. His duties required making sure that the area around the crane was clear when it was moving, and attaching light shackles weighing two to three pounds to machinery being loaded aboard ship.

In September of 1971, he was assigned to piping work at the Graving Dock.[1] The work was located about fifty feet below ground level and reached by gangways from ground to ship and then from the deck down through the ship by steps. While at the Graving Dock, he was promoted to first class rigger.

At the Graving Dock, Claimant had a third class rigger as a helper. He states that the helper did the running, fetching and heavy work. The chain falls used in moving the pipe weighed forty to sixty pounds. Claimant could help in the handling of these falls but, because of his injury, he was not able to lift them himself.

---

[1] Graving Dock: a dry basin where ships are constructed – used instead of a way: a dry dock.

During his employment at the Graving Dock, Claimant states that the Employer complained that he was not "putting enough pipe in there". On the other hand, he maintains that he and a "green" helper were doing the work generally done by a crew of three to four men.

Claimant was assigned to other jobs while employed at the Graving Dock. His special qualifications as a seaman made him eligible for trial trips aboard ship. On these trips he acted as winchman, and on occasion handled the lines in letting go and tying up.

The evidence shows that while at the Graving Dock Claimant worked overtime – as many as 96 hours a week. In the six months he worked in 1970, he earned $7,971.52. In 1971 he earned $11,230.72 of which $10,200.00 was paid by Bethlehem and $1,030.72 was paid by the union.

In answer to a question concerning his post operative ability to do seaman and rigger jobs, the Claimant summarized his own estimate of his ability: (Tr. 51, 52)

> A. Well, if I was required to do all of the work that they expect of a first-class rigger, then I couldn't do it. On a daily basis, I could not do that heavy lifting, climbing, et cetera.
>
> Q. Tell us why not.
>
> A. For one, I don't have the strength anymore. I cannot pick or lift these heavy items that I could before. I was always very proud of my strength and it causes me great deal of – I can't pick it up for one thing, Harry.
>
> If I am standing any length of time or sitting for any length of time I become stiff and my back hurts. Periodically I make moves which

causes a sharp pain, not only in my right leg but also in my left leg. And I have adjusted my body to compensate for the problem that I am having in order to function daily.

As long as I am not picking up, lifting, or bending, I am all right.

In February 1971, Claimant became shop stewart at the Bethlehem Yard. His duties were divided between work as a first-class rigger and union business. He was paid separately for time devoted to each job at the first-class rigger rate. Subsequently, he was elected President of the union local.

That position was a full time job. He acted as the senior union person in the yard. The main physical output requirement of the union position was walking. Claimant was shop steward and union local President for two years.

At the time of the hearing, Claimant was temporarily assigned through the AFL–CIO Department of Community Services to the National Council on alcoholism as its local representative to the Baltimore area chapter on alcoholism. He was selected over three other candidates for the job. He describes this job as being without security and dependent on continued federal finding. His main physical exertion is driving. He keeps records and makes reports. The job pays him $12,000.00 per annum. Though not working for Bethlehem, he remains on leave of absence status with the option to return.

The record is not clear as to time, but Claimant was offered a job in the yard as crane operator at $.60 per hour more than the rate paid first-class rigger. He declined this offer because he felt unable to climb the ladder eighty feet to the cab and sit at the controls for eight hours a day.

Mr. Clyde Eugene Kabe, a rigging quarterman, was called as a witness by the Employer. He was Claimant's supervisor during his post injury employment at the Graving Dock. He assigned Mr. Kendall his duties the same as any other first class rigger. Kendall performed the duties as well as any man could ask. He testified that physical requirements in the work of first class and second class riggers are the same. Mr. Kabe characterized Claimant as a very good man –" . . . as good as we had down there . . ."

Frank George Gorki worked as a first class rigger in the rigging gang at the Graving Dock with Claimant. This employee testified that Claimant was a very good worker and a hard worker.

Both employees testified that they knew of no difficulties which Mr. Kendall may have had in the performance of his work at the Graving Dock. And, they stated that they did not hear him complain that he could not do the work required of him.

On November 19, 1971, Claimant reported another back injury to the Company. Claimant's Exhibit 8 contains his statement that while pulling a towing line from the tug he felt something pop in his back.

Medical – history and opinion

The Claimant has a long standing history of back complaints.

The records of Humble Oil and Refining Company show that on November 19, 1961, he was admitted to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in Baltimore on a complaint that "I sprained or strained my lumbo sacral (sic) area". The day after an auto pedestrian accident in Baltimore County Maryland. He was released from the hospital on November 27, 1961, and remained on Sick Leave through January 2, 1962.

Again from November 2 through November 9, 1962, Mr. Kendall was an outpatient at the same hospital on his complaint of "recurrence of back ailment sustained in auto accident 11/18/61". For this reason he was on sick leave from November 23, 1962, through January 15, 1963.

The Claimant acknowledges the above hospitalizations. However, he states that he was told at the hospital there was nothing wrong with his back. Treatment consisted of rest.

When confronted with Humble's record on cross examination, he stated it was untrue. He presented no evidence then or later in rebuttal of the facts stated in the record.

At the time Claimant applied for employment with Bethlehem, he had a claim pending for permanent total disability of a hand. Hiring was deferred pending a determination of the claim. It appears that a 10% loss of use (disability) was awarded.

In the application for employment with Bethlehem as painter or rigger, dated May 2, 1968, Claimant stated that he had no physical defects. Although there is some evidence that the hand injury was disclosed to the Employer, there is no evidence that his back problems were disclosed.

After Claimant's injury on September 27, 1969, he was examined and treated by G. Lee Russo, M.D., a neurosurgeon, of Baltimore, Maryland. Examination revealed nerve root irritation at L5-S1. After a week of conservative treatment, a myelogram was performed and it revealed a disc protrusion at the L4-L5 level.

The protruding disc was surgically removed on November 12, 1969. The L-5 space was the explored and the nerve root was seen to be under no compression there.

Claimant was discharge from the hospital on November 23, 1969, with instructions to limit activity, take davron, and return for office examination in six weeks.

Postoperatively, Claimant was followed by Dr. Russo. On June 8, 1970, Claimant was discharged from the Doctor's care to return to work with reference to his back. Claimant was next seen by Israel Weiner, M.D., an associate of Dr. Russo on December 6, 1971. According to Doctor's report of that date, Claimant's Exhibit 5, he complained of having wrenched his back at work and felt an immediate snapping sensation in his low back. He continued to work at his regular job.

On examination Dr. Weiner reported the lumbosacral spine was normal in configuration. Mobility was fairly good, with complaint of pain at extremes of bending in all directions. There was no focal neurologic deficit, in terms of motion, reflex, or sensory function. X-rays were ordered, and the Claimant, was instructed to return if his symptoms did not improve. He did not return in connection with this "flareup".

At the request of his attorney, Claimant was seen by Dr. Russo on January 12, 1973, "to evaluate Mr. Kendall for disability". In his testimony at the formal hearing, the Doctor read from his report of the examination:

> Q. Can you tell us in detail what limitation of motion of his physical performance is?
>
> A. As described in the examination, I will just read it.
>
> "The examination shows straight leg raising to be uncomfortable at about seventy to eighty degrees bilaterally, lumbar mobility is mildly limited in flexion, but extension and lateral bending are good".

Q. All right, now . . .

Mr. Cinnamond. He hasn't finished.

The Witness: That's right. The rest is negative. It says "There is no spinal tenderness, and there is no focal neurologic deficit".

Q. Now, can you tell us what effect, with a reasonable medical probability, the deficit which you report would reasonably – what effect they would reasonably be expected to have on Mr. Kendall's day to day activities.

A. It would produce moderate limitation of his ability to engage in strenuous exertion for a prolonged physical work. (Tr. 215)

The Doctor, on further questioning, agreed with counsel that the inability, described by Claimant to climb a ladder and sit in a crane all day was consistent with his estimate of disability on his examination. It was further elicited that there is nothing further that medical science can do for this man.

Dr. Russo saw Claimant again, and for the last time in September 1973. At that time he complained of back pain resulting from a strain while on vacation. Claimant was told by the Doctor to take it easy and take a little pain medicine.

By letter, dated June 25, 1970, Dr. Russo wrote to Attorney for Claimant:

> "This note is to inform you that the above named patient has retained a 20% permanent partial disability".

At the formal hearing, Dr. Russo reaffirmed his earlier estimate that the Claimant would retain a twenty percent disability in his lower back. (Tr. 214)

Robert John Brandt, M.D. of Bethlehem Steel Corporation was called as a witness for the employer. His curriculum vitae showed that he was Board Certified in Occupational Medicine. His duties at Bethlehem include "examining workers for proper placement so that they don't injure themselves or can work safely on the job".

Doctor Brandt testified from Kendall's medical records at Bethlehem.

The first examination was the pre-employment physical on May 3, 1968. The record showed that Kendall denied previous injury to the back or head.

Dr. Brandt examined Claimant on January 5, 1971. With reference to the back, Dr. Brandt stated.

> "The findings related specifically to his back complaints were the operative scar, tightness of the muscles with some flattening, he had full motion in all directions. An examination of straight leg raising was carried out to eighty degrees, and he became slightly uncomfortable from there to ninety. There was no atrophy of the quadriceps by measurement, reflexes were two plus, and there was no evidence of loss of sensation". (Tr. 302)

The Doctor was asked for and stated the duties of a rigger. He expressed the opinion that Claimant suffered a 5% anatomical loss of function. In his opinion, at the time of that examination, Kendall was able to do the work of a rigger.

On December 5, 1972, the Claimant was again examined by Doctor Brandt for an evaluation of the back problem. After conducting the same examination as the previous with slightly different results, he concluded that Claimant suffered a 15% anatomical disability. In response to the question of whether or not Kendall could work as a rigger, Dr. Brandt stated, "In my judgment I feel he could perform the duties of a rigger". Further, he stated that workers who have had back surgery are no more prone to re-injury. In his opinion there was no relationship between the original injury and the alleged reinjury claimed by Kendall in November 1971.

Comment

The foregoing overlong development of the evidence in this case is a distillation of an overlong, difficult record. Evidence pertinent to the issues had to be searched out among many irrelevancies. Too, in reciting the evidence due regard had to be given to charges that the original decision failed to consider "substantial evidence" of disability: that the evidence relied on in that decision was "shot through with contradictions and too vague", and, that pertinent evidence was ignored.

In the interest of fairness it must be noted that the argument of Claimant in support of a Petition to review is in some places inaccurate, and, in other places, it is misleading.

The argument in support of Claimant's Petition states that Dr. Brandt rated Kendall at 5% disability in June, 1970. The fact is that this evaluation was made in examination on January 5, 1971. (Tr. 300). This was elicited by Counsel for Claimant. (Tr. 307) Further, it was December 5, 1972, rather anatomical disability. (Tr. 303, 305)

At page 4 of the argument, Dr. Brandt's testimony is taken out of context and given a meaning not remotely justified by his testimony. He is quoted as saying that Kendall returned to limited work on June 11, 1970, and, from that statement, the conclusion is drawn that Bethlehem gave Kendall "sheltered employment" because of disability. The fact is that the quotation attributed to the Doctor was really the statement of Claimant given by way of a history during a physical examination. (Tr. 304)

Counsel for Claimant infers that the Company recognized Claimant's disability and gave him light duty. Actually, Counsel, on cross examination, elicited the contrary from the Doctor, "The Medical Department, essentially myself, did not give him light duty as such". (Tr. 307)

These inaccuracies and others coupled with disproportionate claims of disability and suffering make the Petition and argument for review unreliable.

Findings of Fact

The Claimant sustained an accidental injury arising out of and in the course of his employment with Bethlehem Steel Corporation on September 27, 1969, within the meaning and coverage of the Act.

Timely notice of the injury was given to the Employer.

Claimant was paid compensation for temporary total disability from September 28, 1969, to June 10, 1970. His average weekly wage was $157.33.

As the result of his injury, Claimant suffered a 15% permanent anatomical impairment of his back. This conclusion is reached on the basis of the testimony of Doctor Brandt. Estimates of impairment or disability of the back range from 5% to 20%. While Claimant was actively

engaged in work as a rigger, examination of January, 1971, showed a 5% impairment. After Claimant worked for almost two years as Union Steward and President, the impairment rose to 15% as shown by examination of December, 1972. There is doubt as to whether the increase of impairment was due to lack of activity, or to a progression of symptoms, but, since doubts are resolved in favor of the Claimant, the 15% estimate of back impairment is accepted as the fact. Dr. Russo's estimate of a 20% disability was given without adequate foundation and in an apparent attempt to be helpful, it is, therefore, rejected. Claimant's medical condition stabilized in June 1970.

After his return to work in June 1970, the Claimant was able to do all of the work required of a rigger. He worked overtime and put in as many as 96 hours per week. He received a promotion. He made more money as a rigger after his injury than he had made before.

At the time of his injury, Claimant was a rigger by occupation and profession. It is that employment rather than able bodied seaman which must be considered in determining disability. In 1968, Claimant demonstrated by word and deed that he was retired from the sea. The evidence in chief concerns the work required of a rigger and not the work required of a 42 year old man at sea. Whether the Claimant will ever return to rigging after years of public relations work with the Union is questionable, but, again, doubts must be resolved in his favor. *Friend v. Britton*. 95 U.S. App. D.C. F. Supp. 1321 (U.S.D.C. R.I. 1969)

The record amply demonstrates that the Claimant is intelligent, witty, aggressive, and learned in the ways of survival in industry. In his testimony at the hearing he was articulate and quick to grasp any opportunity to advance his position. His ability to organize and conduct union business, to advance in his job, and to change occupational direction

places him high among his peers as shown by their selection of him as a leader. The luster of these qualities is not dimmed by a lack of formal education.

Claimant contends that because of his back injury he had to refuse a crane operator's job. He stated he could not climb the eighty feet to the top of the crane and sit in the cab all day. This is a rationalization. Considering the gregarious, ambitious, aggressive, active nature of Claimant, this job was not suited to him. He chose the arduous work at the Graving Dock over the sedentary crane job. Once at the Graving Dock where he had more freedom than he would as a craneman, he began his successful campaign for Union Steward, President, and upward occupational mobility.

As a whole the case is lacking in candor.

Issue

Whether a Claimant, who suffers a permanent anatomical impairment of his back, sustains an economic disability where he is able to perform his pre-injury job, obtains promotion, and increases his earnings on that job over his pre-injury income.

Conclusions of Law

The Order of Remand requires: "... evaluation of the Petitioner's wage earning capacity considering the type work the petitioner performed prior to his injury, the possible effect of his physical impairment on his ability to continue to do such heavy work, and his prospects if he were forced to seek similar employment on the open labor market". (BRB No. 74-120)

An award of compensation is not required or authorized merely because there is some anatomical

impairment. The duty imposed is to evaluate the extent of a claimant's disability in economic rather than in medical terms. Any determination of disability must take into considration the effect of one's physical condition on his ability or capacity to earn wages. *Owens v. Traynor*, 274 F. Supp. 770 (D.C. Md. 1966), aff'd, 396 F.2d 783 (4th Cir. 1968); *Army and Air Force Exchange v. Neuman Sanders*, BRB No. 122-73 (December 28, 1973).

The 15% anatomical impairment of Claimant's back, standing alone, is not sufficient reason to award compensation. It must be shown that the medical impairment diminishes Claimant's ability to earn wages.

Applying the test for determining disability to the evidence in this case, it must be concluded that Claimant did not sustain a loss of earning capacity due to his injury. As related in the statement and findings of fact, the Claimant returned to his job as a rigger and performed outstandingly in the job. There are no medical restrictions based on the kind of work he does. At times he worked 96 hours a week of straight time and overtime. His income after his return to work as a rigger was greater after the injury than it had been before due largely to overtime. Supervisors described Claimant as a good worker. He was promoted from second-class to first class rigger at the Graving Dock. There is no evidence that he was the beneficiary of a sympathetic employer or that his job was in jeopardy because of his inability to do the work. It is reasonable to infer from the evidence that he would have been promoted to supervisor had he stayed with Bethlehem. His job with Bethlehem is still available to him.

There is no evidence that Claimant will suffer future disablement caused by the injury greater than that presently suffered. Nonetheless, in consideration of the case as a whole, it is a factor to be taken into account. *Travelers Insurance Company v. McLellan*, 288 F.2d 250 (2d Cir. 1961)

In weighing this factor, the medical evidence is the principal guide. By June 1970, nine months after the injury, the Claimant's condition had stabilized. Dr. Russo stated in June 1970, without even knowing what Claimant's work performance would be, that Claimant suffered a 20% disability. From that Doctor it was dramatically elicited that medical science had done all it could for the man. Dr. Brandt found anatomical impairment ranging from 5% to 15% between January 1971, and December 1972, with no physical restrictions on Claimant's work activities in either case. Apart from the evidence, yet another question arises out of the common experience of man. What percentage of Claimant's anatomical impairment is due to the ravages of the aging process?

It can be assumed that Claimant's return to rigging, if it ever occurs, will be a painful experience after years of sedentary employment with the Union. In that sense, he may suffer a disability much the same as a middle aged athlete faces in making a comeback. But, this disability, being the only one inferrable from the evidence, is not compensable.

In view of the conclusion that Claimant has not suffered an economic disability caused by his injury, it is unnecessary to consider formulae for calculating loss posited in *United Fruit Co. v. Cordillo*, 104 F. Supp. 81 (S.D. N.Y. 1952), and *Wiles v. New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Co.*, 283 F.2d 328 (3rd Cir. 1960).

Order

It is, therefore, Ordered that the claim of Joseph P. Kendall for compensation, under the Act, be, and is hereby denied.

/s/ GEORGE A. FATH
Administrative Law Judge

Dated: July 10, 1975
Washington, D.C.

OPINION OF BENEFITS REVIEW BOARD
Filed August 15, 1974

JOSEPH P. KENDALL,
Petitioner,

v.

BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION SPARROWS POINT YARD,
Respondent

BRB No. 74-120

DECISION

Appeal from Decision and Order of Herman T. Benn, Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Department of Labor.

Harry Goldman, Jr., Baltimore, Maryland, for petitioner.

Thomas E. Cinnamond (Semmes, Bowen & Semmes), Baltimore, Maryland, for respondent.

Jean S. Cooper, Washington, D.C., United States Department of Labor (William J. Kilberg, Solicitor of Labor, James G. Johnston, Associate Solicitor of Labor) for the Director, Office of Workmen's Compensation Programs, United States Department of Labor.

Before: Washington, Chairperson, and Miller, Member.*

This is an appeal by the claimant, petitioner herein, to review and set aside a decision and order denying a claim for permanent partial disability benefits and order denying a claim for permanent partial disability benefits as not in accordance with law nor supported by substantial evidence. The claim arises under the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 44 Stat. 1424, as amended, 33 U.S.C. §901 *et seq.* (hereinafter referred to as the Act).

On September 27, 1969, in the course of his employment as a rigger with the respondent, petitioner suffered an injury to his lower back. Respondent paid petitioner compensation for temporary total disability from September 28, 1969, until June 10, 1970, plus medical expenses under Section 7 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §907.

Petitioner claimed entitlement to compensation for permanent partial disability equivalent to a twenty percent

* Member, Ralph M. Hartmen, did not participate in the decision of this case.

loss of wage-earning capacity beginning June 11, 1970, and the deputy commissioner so recommended. Respondent did not accept the deputy commissioner's recommendation. Subsequently, the case was heard by an administrative law judge in December 1973. He determined that the claimant failed to establish an economic disability as contemplated by the Act and denied the claim for compensation.

The Board is asked to determine whether the finding that the petitioner has not suffered any economic disability is supported by substantial evidence in the record considered as a whole.

The standard to be used in determining entitlement to compensation under the Act is economic disability, which is defined as a loss of wage-earning capacity resulting from physical disability. *Owens v. Traynor,* 274 F. Supp. 770 (D.C. Md. 1966), *aff'd*, 396 F.2d 783 (4th Cir. 1968); *Army and Air Force Exchange Service v. Neuman,* 278 F. Supp. 865 (W.D. La. 1967); *Suderman Stevedores v. Seab Sanders,* BRB No. 122-73 (December 28, 1973). In applying this standard, a further consideration which must be recognized is that wages actually received on returning to work after injury are indicative, but not alone determinative, of wage-earning capacity. *United Engineering Co. v. Pillsbury,* 92 F. Supp. 898 (N.D. Cal. 1950), *aff'd,* 187 F.2d 987 (9th Cir. 1951), *aff'd.* 342 U.S. 197, 72 S. Ct. 223 (1952); *Twin Harbor Stevedoring and Tug Co. v. Marshall,* 103 F.2d 513 (9th Cir. 1939).

The decision and order appealed from is silent as to whether future effects of petitioner's injury on his wage-earning capacity were considered by the administrative law judge. It is not disputed that petitioner sustained a permanent, fifteen to twenty percent physical impairment of his lower back. In addition, the record indicates that upon his return to work at the Sparrows Point Yard of Bethlehem Steel Corporation, petitioner did not perform the

same arduous work he had undertaken prior to his injury. The position he accepted as groundsman on the pier is acknowledged to involve lighter work than the usual duties he had performed before the injury. Under the circumstances presented by this case, the Board feels that a finding should have been made as to how the petitioner's physical impairment might affect his earning capacity as it might naturally extend into the future. *See* Section 8 (h) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §908 (h). It has been held that the possibility of future disablement greater than that presently suffered is a factor that the Act directs to be taken into account in determining wage-earning capacity. *Travelers Insurance Co. v. McLellan,* 288 F.2d 250 (2d Cir. 1961).

In determining the possible future economic effects of petitioner's physical impairment, wage-earning capacity may be tested by an assumption that his present employer would dispense with his services, requiring him to secure employment in a competitive labor market. *United Fruit Co. v. Cardillo,* 104 F. Supp. 81 (S.D. N.Y. 1952). *See also, Wiles v. New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Co.,* 283 F.2d 328 (3rd Cir. 1960). The effect of petitioner's impairment on his ability to secure gainful employment in the open labor market at the same wage he had been earning prior to his accident should be determined. A claimant is entitled to a liberal construction of the Act and doubts should be resolved in his favor. *Southern S. S. Co. v. Norton,* 101 F.2d 825 (3rd Cir. 1939).

The administrative law judge relied heavily on *Owens v. Traynor, supra,* in reaching his decision. It should be noted that, although in that case, the Court of Appeals affirmed the finding of no loss of wage-earning capacity, the panel recognized that the claimant had performed relatively sedentary engineering duties. In the case before the Board, the claimant's duties involve the arduous labor of a rigger. The effects of physical impairment on wage-earning capacity may be quite different in these two situations.

This case is remanded to the administrative law judge for reevaluation of the petitioner's wage earning capacity, considering the type of work the petitioner performed prior to his injury, the possible effect of his physical impairment on his ability to continue to do such heavy work, and his prospects if he were forced to seek similar employment on the open labor market.

/s/ Ruth V. Washington,
Chairperson

/s/ Julius Miller,
Member

Dated at Washington, D.C.
this fifteenth day of
August 1974.

DECISION AND ORDER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
Signed March 1, 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Office of Administrative Law Judges
Washington, D.C. 20210

In the Matter of

JOSEPH P. KENDALL,
Claimant

vs.

BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION,
SPARROWS POINT YARD,
Employer

SELF–INSURED

Case No. 74–LHCA–15
(Formerly 3672)

Harry Goldman, Jr., Esquire
One South Calvert Building
Suite 1605
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
For the Claimant

Thomas E. Cinnamond, Esquire
Semmes, Bowen, Semmes
10 Light Street (17th Floor)
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
For the Employer and Carrier

Before: HERMAN T. BENN
Administrative Law Judge

DECISION AND ORDER

This case is brought pursuant to the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. 901 *et seq.* (hereinafter referred to as the Act) and the Rules and Regulations implementing the Act.

A hearing in this case was held on December 5 and 6, 1974, in the City of Baltimore, Maryland. The parties were represented by counsel and were afforded full opportunity to adduce evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses. Thereafter the parties filed briefs in support of their respective positions. The said briefs and attachments are hereby made a part of the record.

Based upon the entire record in this case and from observation of the witnesses and their demeanor, the Court makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

The Claimant, Joseph P. Kendall, was born on August 16, 1931, and is 42 years of age. He has an eighth grade education, and completed training at the United States Maritime Service School in Brooklyn, New York. He is married and resides with his wife and a step-daughter. Claimant graduated from said Maritime School at the age of seventeen as a boatswain's mate first class. Thereafter, from July, 1946 until January, 1968, with the exception of about nine months in 1965 when he worked as a service station manager, he was employed as a seaman, mostly on American Flag vessels.

The Claimant was employed by the Respondent, Bethlehem Steel Corporation–Sparrows Point Yard in August, 1968 as a third-class rigger. While so employed on September 27, 1969, aboard the ship Eagle Charger, but as a second-class

rigger, he was injured. His average weekly wage at the time of the injury was $157.33. Compensation for temporary total disability was paid by the Respondent at the rate of $70.00 per week from September 28, 1969 to June 10, 1970, totaling $2,560.00, plus medical expenses under Section 7 of the Act.

The Claimant's post injury work activity and earnings include the following:

(1) On June 11, 1970, the Claimant returned to his former work as a second-class rigger with the Respondent, working as a groundman on the pier. Subsequently on or about August 24, 1970, he was promoted to a first-class rigger with an increase in pay. He earned $7,971.52 in 1970 after returning to work in June, and missed no time from work during this period.

(2) In 1971, the Claimant held the position of shop steward in his union in addition to his work with the Respondent as rigger. He earned $10,200.00 for his work with the Respondent; and $1,030.72 for his work with the union in 1971.

(3) The Claimant ran for and was elected president of his union in January, 1972; and devoted full time to this position, for which he earned $8,639.15 in 1972.

(4) The Claimant's term as president of the union expired in May, 1973. He secured a more remunerative position with the Baltimore Council of Alcoholism, as of June 1, 1973, earning $12,000.00 per annum. His position with the said Council is tenuous, depending to a large extent on the outcome of refunding. However, the Respondent is holding open the position of first-class rigger for his return, if he so desires.

The position of the Claimant, in effect, is that since he has a residual anatomical impairment of the back of up to 20 percent which limits his ability to function on a sustained basis certain strenuous activity, such as is required of an able-bodied seaman, he is entitled to compensation under the Act for permanent partial disability.

The position of the Respondent is to the effect, that since the Claimant's post-injury earning capability is as much as it was prior to the injury of September 27, 1969, the Claimant is not entitled to any compensation under the provisions of the Act subsequent to June 10, 1970, having returned to work on June 11, 1970, even though there may be an anatomical impairment of his back of up to 20 percent. The issue thus raised is whether the evidence establishes that the Claimant is entitled to any compensation subsequent to June 10, 1970, on the basis of a permanent partial disability of up to 20 percent impairment of his lower back?

Economic disability rather than physical disability is the standard to be used for compensation purposes under Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. *Army and Air Force Exchange Service v. Neuman*, 278 F. Supp. 865.

The evidence that the Claimant suffers up to 15 or 20 percent impairment of his lower back as a result of the injury hereinvolved is uncontradicted. However it is also true that the evidence establishes that the Claimant received as much or more in wages subsequent to the injury as prior to his said job related injury. "Disability" means incapacity because of injury to *earn* the wages which the employee was receiving *at the time of injury* in the same or any other employment, 33 U.S.C. 902 (10).

It is true that an employee's actual earnings after he returns to work do not conclusively prove his wage-earning capacity. The employer may be willing to allow the claimant to

return to his old job although the claimant is unable to do all of the work connected therewith and would be handicapped in obtaining another job by his disability. On the other hand, the claimant may be earning less than he did before the accident not because of any disability resulting from the accident but because of economic conditions or some infirmity not caused or aggravated by the injury. *Owens v. Traynor*, 274 F. Supp. 770.

The evidence here establishes that the Claimant returned to his former job on June 11, 1970 as second-class rigger. He worked as groundman on the pier. The testimony of the Claimant as well as two of his coworkers including a supervisor established that the Claimant performed his duties well. In fact he was promoted to first-class rigger in August, 1970 which involved an increase in pay.

The court therefore finds that the income received by the Claimant after he returned to work on June 11, 1970 fairly represents his post-injury "earning capacity."

The Longshoremen's Act does not permit the award of compensation for permanent partial disability aside from scheduled disability unless there has been some loss of wage-earning capacity, *Owens v. Traynor, supra.*

The evidence establishes that the Claimant's post-injury earning capacity is as much, indeed exceeds, his pre-injury earnings. Therefore no "economic disability" as contemplated under the Act has been established.

The Claimant's contention that since his job-related injury resulted in an impairment which precludes him from engaging in certain occupations, including his former work as an able-bodied seaman, he is "disabled" within the meaning of the Act is without merit. Section 2 (10) (33 U.S.C. 902 (10) of the Act provides: "Disability means incapacity because of injury to earn the wages which the employee was receiving at the time of injury in the same or any other employment."

According to the statement included in the transcript at page 325, Section 702.132 of Title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations, which involves the procedure for the approval of attorney fees, was called to the attention of counsel for the Claimant. However no application has been filed pursuant to said regulation. Therefore no fee is being approved in respect to this case.

Order

It Is Hereby Ordered, that the claim for payment of compensation subsequent to June 10, 1970 under the Act is denied.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 1st day of March, 1974.

/s/ HERMAN T. BENN
Administrative Law Judge

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

33 U.S.C. 901, et seq.

An Act To provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain maritime employment, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 1. This Act may be cited as "Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act."

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. When used in this Act –

* * * * * * *

(10) "Disability" means incapacity because of injury to earn the wages which the employee was receiving at the time of injury in the same or any other employment.

* * * * * * *

COMPENSATION FOR DISABILITY

Sec. 8. Compensation for disability shall be paid to the employee as follows:

* * * * * * *

(c) Permanent partial disability: In case of disability partial in character but permanent in quality the compensation shall be 66 2/3 per centum of the average weekly wages, which shall be in addition to compensation for temporary total disability or temporary partial disability paid in accordance with subdivision (b) or subdivision (e) of this section respectively and shall be paid to the employee, as follows:

(1) Arm lost, three hundred and twelve weeks' compensation.

(2) Leg lost, two hundred and eighty-eight weeks' compensation.

(3) Hand lost, two hundred and forty-four weeks' compensation.

(4) Foot lost, two hundred and five weeks' compensation.

(5) Eye lost, one hundred and sixty weeks' compensation.

(6) Thumb lost, seventy-five weeks' compensation.

(7) First finger lost, forty-six weeks' compensation.

(8) Great toe lost, thirty-eight weeks' compensation.

(9) Second finger lost, thirty weeks' compensation.

(10) Third finger lost, twenty-five weeks' compensation.

(11) Toe other than great toe lost, sixteen weeks' compensation.

(12) Fourth finger lost, fifteen weeks' compensation.

(13) Loss of hearing: Compensation for loss of hearing of one ear, fifty-two weeks. Compensation for loss of hearing of both ears, two hundred weeks.

(14) Phalanges: Compensation for loss of more than one phalange of a digit shall be the same as for loss of the entire digit. Compensation for loss of the first phalange shall be one-half of the compensation or loss of the entire digit.

(15) Amputated arm or leg: Compensation for an arm or a leg, if amputated at or above the elbow or the knee, shall be the same as for a loss of the arm or leg; but, if amputated between the elbow and the wrist or the knee and the ankle, shall be the same as for loss of a hand or foot.

(16) Binocular vision or per centum of vision: Compensation for loss of binocular vision or for 80 per centum or more of the vision of an eye shall be the same as for loss of the eye.

(17) Two or more digits: Compensation for loss of two or more digits or one or more phalanges of two or more digits, of a hand or foot may be proportioned to the loss of use of the hand or foot occasioned thereby, but shall not exceed the compensation for loss of a hand or foot.

(18) Total loss of use: Compensation for permanent total loss of use of a member shall be the same as for loss of the member.

(19) Partial loss or partial loss of use: Compensation for permanent partial loss or loss of use of a member may be for proportionate loss or loss of use of the member.

(20) Disfigurement: Proper and equitable compensation not to exceed $3,500 shall be awarded for serious disfigurement of the face, head, or neck or of other normally exposed areas likely to handicap the employee in securing or maintaining employment.

(21) Other cases: In all other cases in this class of disability the compensation shall be 66 2/3 per centum of the difference between his average weekly wages and his wage-earning capacity thereafter in the same employment or otherwise, payable during the continuance of such partial disability, but subject to reconsideration of the degree of such impairment by the deputy commissioner on his own motion or upon application of any party in interest.

* * * * * * *

(h) The wage-earning capacity of an injured employee in cases of partial disability under subdivisions (c) (21) of this section or under subdivision (e) of this section shall be determined by his actual earnings if such actual earnings fairly and reasonably represent his wage-earning capacity: Provided, however, That if the employee has no actual earnings or his actual earnings do not fairly and reasonably represent his wage-earning capacity, the deputy commissioner may, in the interest of justice, fix such wage-earning capacity as shall be reasonable, having due regard to the nature of his injury, the degree of physical impairment, his usual employment, and any other factors or circumstances in the case which may affect his capacity to earn wages in his disabled condition, including the effect of disability as it may naturally extend into the future.

* * * * * * *

PROCEDURE IN RESPECT OF CLAIMS

Sec. 19.

* * * * * * *

(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, any hearing held under this Act shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 554 of title 5 of the United States Code. Any such hearing shall be conducted by a hearing examiner qualified under section 3105 of that title. All powers, duties, and responsibilities vested by this Act, on the date of enactment of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1972, in the deputy commissioners with respect to such hearings shall be vested in such hearing examiners.

* * * * * * *

PRESUMPTIONS

Sec. 20. In any proceeding for the enforcement of a claim for compensation under this Act it shall be presumed, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary –

(a) That the claim comes within the provisions of this Act.

* * * * * * *

REVIEW OF COMPENSATION ORDER

Sec. 21.

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) There is hereby established a Benefits Review Board which shall be composed of three members appointed

by the Secretary from among individuals who are especially qualified to serve on such Board. The Secretary shall designate one of the members of the Board to serve as chairman.

(2) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act, two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum and official action can be taken only on the affirmative vote of at least two members.

(3) The Board shall be authorized to hear and determine appeals raising a substantial question of law or fact taken by any party in interest from decisions with respect to claims of employees under this Act and the extensions thereof. The Board's orders shall be based upon the hearing record. The findings of fact in the decision under review by the Board shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence in the record considered as a whole. The payment of the amounts required by an award shall not be stayed pending final decision in any such proceeding unless ordered by the Board. No stay shall be issued unless irreparable injury would otherwise ensue to the employer or carrier.

(4) The Board may, on its own motion or at the request of the Secretary, remand a case to the hearing examiner for further appropriate action. The consent of the parties in interest shall not be a prerequisite to a remand by the Board.

* * * * * * *